## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### **CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	CV 12-9912	2-ABC (SHx)	August 12, 2014				
Title	Fourth Ag	ge LTD, et al., v. Warner Bros., et al.,					
Present: The Honorable		Stephen J. Hillma	an				
S	Sandra Butler						
Deputy Clerk			Court Reporter / Recorde	er	Tape No.		
Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:		Attorneys Present for Defendants:					
N/A			N/A				
Proceeding	gs: (]	N CHAMBERS)					

With respect to Document numbers 285, 289 and 290, the court notes that Warner and Zaentz's interpretation of this court's July 22, 2014 Order (document 280) is correct. The court's intention is to substantively review <u>in camera</u> a sampling of documents. The court's finding that Plaintiff's privilege logs are facially adequate was only the first step the court intended to undertake. The court impliedly, and now explicitly, finds that there is justification for a limited <u>in camera</u> substantive review of the selected documents. The court's comment in the July 22, 2014 Order that "further document review" may be required was intended to convey that, depending on the result of the initial in camera "sampling" review, <u>in camera</u> review of other documents may or may not be required.

Plaintiff shall lodge the documents listed by defendants <u>in camera</u> within ten days, as well as <u>file and serve</u> a list of names of the authors and recipients of the documents, including a description of each person's role. After an initial in camera review of the documents, the court likely will schedule a hearing, which will afford all parties the opportunity to argue why specific documents are or are not privileged. The court has successfully held this type of hearing in the past, without revealing the contents of any documents, while insuring that the challenging parties have sufficient information to challenge particular documents.

### 

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### **CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case	No.	CV 12-9912-ABC (SHx)	Date	August 12, 2014				
Title		Fourth Age LTD, et al., v. Warner Bros., et al.,						
Plaintiff's request for <u>in camera</u> review of defendants' privilege entries is not proper before the court at this time.								
cc:	District Judge Collins Counsel of Record* *the term "counsel" as used herein also includes any pro se party. See Local Rule 2.9.3.							
			_	:				
		Initials of Prep	arer					